NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SPED
SPECIAL EDUCATION

Office of Special Education
Equity Guidance August 2020

What is significant disproportionality?

Significant disproportionality occurs when children from a particular racial or ethnic group in a LEA are found to be at significantly greater risk of being identified for special education services, identified for special education services in a particular category, or once in special education, placed separately from their peers or removed from their least restrictive environment for disciplinary reasons.

Has the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) issued guidance around significant disproportionality?

Per 34 CFR §300.646-647, all states are required to annually identify local educational agencies (LEAs) with significant disproportionality. The analytic methods are prescribed by the regulations and involve risk ratios and alternate risk ratios. OSEP has created a document that answers many common questions about the regulations. These policies have been implemented in Nebraska according to the following information.

Photos are for illustrative purposes only. Any person depicted in the photo is a model.

For which racial/ethnic groups is significant disproportionality calculated?

Significant disproportionality must be calculated for seven racial/ethnic groups, when there are a sufficient number of students in the group to allow for reliable calculations. The groups are:

1. American Indian or Alaskan Native,
2. Asian,
3. Black or African American,
4. Hispanic/Latino,
5. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander,
6. White, and
7. Two or More Races.

What is Nebraska's definition of significant disproportionality?

Nebraska considers an LEA to have significant disproportionality when the risk ratio for any racial/ethnic group in any of the required identification, placement, or discipline categories exceeds 4.0 for three consecutive years. The required categories, as well as exceptions for small numbers are described below. There are 14 required categories and 7 required racial/ethnic groups; therefore, there are 14 x 7 = 98 required calculations per LEA.

How does Nebraska calculate significant disproportionality for identification?

Significant disproportionality in identification occurs when children ages 3-21 in a particular racial/ethnic group are at a significantly greater risk than their peers in other racial/ethnic groups of being:

1. identified as a child with a disability,

2. identified as a child with a specific learning disability,

3. identified as a child with an intellectual disability,

4. identified as a child with a speech and language impairment,

5. identified as a child with other health impairment,

6. identified as a child with autism, or

7. identified as a child with an emotional disturbance.

OSEP does not require disproportionality calculations for the remaining disability categories because they typically have very small numbers of children.

The risk for children from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups) to be identified in a category is calculated by dividing the number of children from the specified racial or ethnic group (or groups) being identified in that category by the total number of children from that racial or ethnic group or groups enrolled in the LEA. For example, if an LEA has 100 Asian children enrolled and 10 of them are identified as children with disabilities,

$$\frac{\textbf{10} \; Asian \; children \; with \; disabilities}{\textbf{100} \; Asian \; children \; enrolled}$$

then the risk for an Asian child to be identified as a child with a disability in that LEA is 10/100 or 10%.

$$Risk \; for \; Asian \; children = \textbf{10\%}$$

If, in the same LEA, there are 200 non-Asian children enrolled and 10 of them are identified as children with disabilities,

$$\frac{\textbf{10} \; non-Asian \; children \; with \; disabilities}{\textbf{200} \; non-Asian \; children \; enrolled}$$

then the risk for a non-Asian child to be identified as a child with a disability is 10/200 or 5%.

$$Risk \; for \; non-Asian \; children = \textbf{5\%}$$

The risk ratio for children from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups) to be identified in a category is the ratio of the risk for children from that group to the risk for children not in that group. Continuing the prior example, the risk ratio for Asian children and special education identification in that LEA would be 10/5 or 2.0.

$$Risk \; ratio = \textbf{10/5} = \textbf{2.0}$$

We could say that Asian children in the LEA are twice as likely as non-Asian children to be identified for special education. Since this risk ratio is below the threshold of 4.0, the LEA would not be considered significantly disproportionate for Asian children and disability identification.

A LEA is considered to have significant disproportionality when it is significantly disproportionate for a particular racial/ethnic group and disability category for three consecutive years.

What is disproportionate representation (SPP/APR Indicators 9 and 10) and how is it related to significant disproportionality for identification?

In Nebraska, LEAs that have an identification risk ratio greater than 3 for children ages 6-21 for the current year are considered to have disproportionate representation. LEAs with disproportionate representation are encouraged to take steps to identify and address factors contributing to their disproportionalities before they are found to have a significant disproportionality.

Nebraska is required to report counts and percentages of LEAs with disproportionate representation in the category of identification as a child with a disability for the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Indicator 9, and counts and percentages of LEAs with disproportionate representation in the six specific identification categories for SPP/APR Indicator 10.

Nebraska is also required to determine whether each instance of disproportionate representation it identified was the result of inappropriate identification and report in Indicators 9 and 10 counts of LEAs for which it was. To this end, Nebraska requires LEAs with a disproportionate representation to complete and return a policy, procedure and practice review checklist and to send supporting documents, including student files as requested by NDE.

What is Nebraska's significant disproportionality definition for placement?

Significant disproportionality in placement occurs when children with disabilities ages 6-21 in a particular racial/ethnic group are at a significantly greater risk than their peers in other racial/ethnic groups of being:

1. inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day

2. inside separate schools and residential facilities (not including homebound or hospital settings, correctional facilities, or private schools).

The risk for children with disabilities from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups) to be placed in a particular environment is calculated by dividing the number of children with disabilities from the specified racial or ethnic group (or groups) being placed in that environment by the total number of children with disabilities from that racial or ethnic group or groups in the LEA. For example, if an LEA has 50 Black children with disabilities and 30 of them are placed inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day,

$$\frac{30 \ Black \ children \ with \ disabilities \ placed \ inside \ the \ regular \ class \ for \ less \ than \ \textbf{40\%} \ of \ the \ day}{50 \ Black \ children \ with \ disabilities}$$

then the risk for a Black child with a disability to be placed inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day is 30/50 or 60%.

Risk for Black children with disabilities = **60%**

If, in the same LEA, there are 100 non-Black children with disabilities and 10 of them are placed inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day,

$$\frac{10 \ non-Black \ children \ with \ disabilities \ placed \ inside \ the \ regular \ class \ for \ less \ than \ \textbf{40\%} \ of \ the \ day}{100 \ non-Black \ children \ with \ disabilities}$$

then the risk for a non-Black child to be placed inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day is 10/100 or 10%.

Risk for non – Black children with disabilities = **10%**

The risk ratio for children with disabilities from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups) to be placed in a particular environment is the ratio of the risk for children from that group to the risk for children not in that group. Continuing the prior example, the risk ratio for Black children with disabilities and placement inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day would be 60/10 or 6.0.

Risk ratio = **60/10** = **6.0**

We could say that Black children with disabilities in the LEA are six times as likely as non-Black children with disabilities to be placed inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day. Since this risk ratio is above the threshold of 4.0, the LEA would be considered significantly disproportionate for Black children with disabilities and placement inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day.

A LEA is considered to have significant disproportionality when it is significantly disproportionate for a particular racial/ethnic group and disability category for three consecutive years.

What is Nebraska's significant disproportionality definition for discipline?

Significant disproportionality in discipline occurs when children with disabilities ages 3-21 in a particular racial/ethnic group are at a significantly greater risk than their peers in other racial/ethnic groups of being:

1. OSS ≤ 10. Suspended out-of-school or expelled for 10 days or fewer

2. OSS > 10. Suspended out-of-school or expelled for more than 10 days

3. ISS ≤ 10. Suspended in-school for 10 days or fewer

4. ISS > 10. Suspended in-school for more than 10 days.

The risk for children with disabilities from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups) to be disciplined in a particular way is calculated by dividing the number of children with disabilities from the specified racial or ethnic group (or groups) being disciplined in that way by the total number of children with disabilities from that racial or ethnic group or groups in the LEA.

For example, if an LEA has 1000 White children with disabilities and 50 of them are suspended in-school for more than 10 days,

$$\frac{\mathbf{50} \ White \ children \ with \ disabilities \ suspended \ in-school \ for \ more \ than \ \mathbf{10} \ days}{\mathbf{1000} \ White \ children \ with \ disabilities}$$

then the risk for a White child with a disability to be suspended in-school for more than 10 days is 50/1000 or 5%.

$$Risk \ for \ White \ children \ with \ disabilities = \mathbf{5\%}$$

If, in the same LEA, there are 100 non-White children with disabilities and 10 of them are suspended in-school for more than 10 days,

$$\frac{(\mathbf{10} \ non-White \ children \ with \ disabilities \ suspended \ in\text{-}school \ for \ more \ than \ \mathbf{10} \ days)/(\mathbf{100} \ non-White \ children \ with \ disabilities)}{\mathbf{100} \ non-White \ children \ with \ disabilities}$$

then the risk for a non-White child to be suspended in-school for more than 10 days is 10/100 or 10%.

$$Risk \ for \ non-White \ children \ with \ disabilities = \mathbf{10}\%$$

The risk ratio for children with disabilities from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups) to be disciplined in a particular way is the ratio of the risk for children from that group to the risk for children not in that group. Continuing the prior example, the risk ratio for White children with disabilities and in-school suspension for more than 10 days would be 5/10 or 0.5.

$$Risk \ ratio = \mathbf{5/10} = \mathbf{0.5}$$

We could say that White children with disabilities in the LEA are half as likely as non-White children with disabilities to be suspended in-school for more than 10 days. Since this risk ratio is below the threshold of 4.0, the LEA would not be considered significantly disproportionate for White children with disabilities in the category of suspended in-school for more than 10 days.

5. Total Removals. Significant disproportionality in discipline also occurs when children with disabilities ages 3-21 in a particular racial/ethnic group experience a significantly greater average number of disciplinary removals than their peers in other racial/ethnic groups. The total number of removals includes in-school and out-of-school suspensions, expulsions, removals by school personnel to an interim alternative educational setting, and removals by a hearing officer.

The total removals per child (TRPC) for children with disabilities from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups) is calculated by dividing the total number of removals for children ages 3-21 from the specified racial or ethnic group (or groups) by the total number of children with disabilities from that racial or ethnic group or groups in the LEA.

For example, if an LEA has 100 Hispanic/Latino children with disabilities and 120 total removals between them,

$$\frac{120 \text{ total removals for Hispanic or Latino children with disabilities}}{100 \text{ Hispanic or Latino children with disabilities}}$$

then the TRPC for Hispanic/Latino children with disabilities is 120/100 or 1.2.

$$\textit{Total Removals Per Hispanic or Latino Child} = \mathbf{120/100} = \mathbf{1.2}$$

If, in the same LEA, there are 100 children with disabilities who are not Hispanic or Latino and these children experience 60 total removals,

$$\frac{60 \text{ total removals for non} - \text{Hispanic or Latino children with disabilities}}{100 \text{ non} - \text{Hispanic or Latino children with disabilities}}$$

then the TRPC for children who are not Hispanic or Latino is 60/100 or 0.6.

$$\textit{Total Removals Per non} - \textit{Hispanic or Latino Child} = \mathbf{60/100} = \mathbf{0.6}$$

The TRPC ratio for children with disabilities from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups is the ratio of the TRPC for children from that group to the TRPC for children not in that group. Continuing the prior example, the TRPC ratio for Hispanic/Latino children with disabilities would be 1.2 / 0.6 or 2.0.

$$\textit{Total Removals Per Child Ratio} = \mathbf{1.2/0.6} = \mathbf{2.0}$$

We could say that Hispanic/Latino children with disabilities in the LEA receive twice as many disciplinary removals as children who are not Hispanic/Latino. Since this TRPC ratio is below the threshold of 4.0, the LEA would not be considered significantly disproportionate for Hispanic/Latino children with disabilities in the total removals category.

Indicator 4: What is significant discrepancy (SPP/APR Indicator 4) and how is it related to significant disproportionality for discipline?

SPP/APR Indicator 4 focuses on significant discrepancy. The data comes from a single discipline category: being suspended out-of-school or expelled for more than 10 days. Federal regulations allow states many options for performing significant discrepancy calculations, but none of them match the calculation allowed for significant disproportionality. In particular, significant disproportionality requires a direct comparison of racial/ethnic groups with each other within each LEA, while significant discrepancy prohibits such a comparison.

In Nebraska, significant discrepancy calculations use risk as the basic calculation. LEAs in which children with disabilities ages 3-21 have a risk of greater than 5% are considered to have a significant discrepancy. Nebraska is required to report a count of its LEAs with a significant discrepancy for SPP/APR indicator 4A

LEAs in which children with disabilities ages 3-21 from any particular racial or ethnic group have a risk of greater than 5% are also considered to have a significant discrepancy.

Nebraska is required to report a count of its LEAs with a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity for SPP/APR indicator 4B. The state must also report a count and percentage of its LEAs that have a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity and also policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. To this end, Nebraska requires LEAs with a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity to complete and return a policy and procedure review checklist which includes these factors and to send supporting documents, including student files as requested by NDE. LEAs with significant discrepancies by race or ethnicity are also encouraged to take steps to identify and address the root causes of the discrepancies before they are found to have a significant disproportionality.

What if we have a small number of children? Non-calculation and alternate risk ratios

The regulations allow states to exclude from the calculations groups that are too small for reliable calculations. Nebraska uses a minimum cell size of 10 and a minimum n size of 30. This has consequences for all disproportionate representation, significant discrepancy, and significant disproportionality calculations. The particular consequences depend on whether the small numbers affect the target group or the comparison group.

- Target group cell size. If the target racial or ethnic group has fewer than 10 children in the numerator of any risk or TRPC calculation, that calculation is not performed for that racial or ethnic group. For example, if an LEA has fewer than 10 American Indian or Alaskan Native children identified with emotional disturbance, then no risk calculation is made for American Indian or Alaskan Native children in the emotional disturbance category. This would affect significant disproportionality and indicator 10.

- Target group n size. If the target racial or ethnic group has fewer than 30 children in the denominator of any risk or TRPC calculation, that calculation is not performed for that racial or ethnic group. For example, if an LEA has fewer than 30 Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander children identified with a disability, then no risk calculations are made for American Indian or Alaskan Native children in any of the seven placement or discipline categories of significant disproportionality, nor for significant discrepancy (indicator 4B).

- Comparison group cell size and n size. If the comparison group has fewer than 10 children in the numerator of any risk or TRPC calculation, or fewer than 30 in the denominator of any risk or TRPC calculation, it is replaced by a comparison group at the state level, which is presumed to be large enough. This is called an "alternate risk ratio." For example, if an LEA has 30 or more White children with disabilities, with 10 or more of them inside separate schools and residential facilities, then a risk calculation can be made. If, however, the LEA has fewer than 30 non-White children with disabilities or fewer than 10 inside separate schools and residential facilities, then the alternative risk ratio must be used. The risk for White children in the LEA is divided by the state-level risk for non-White children.

$$\frac{15 \ \textit{White children with disabilities inside separate schools and residential facilities}}{60 \ \textit{White children with disabilities}}$$

$$Risk = \mathbf{15/60} = \mathbf{0.25}$$

$$\frac{100 \ non-White \ children \ with \ disabilities \ inside \ separate \ schools \ and \ residential \ facilities \ IN \ THE \ STATE}{200 \ non-White \ children \ with \ disabilities \ IN \ THE \ STATE}$$

$$State\text{-}Level \ Risk = \mathbf{100/200} = \mathbf{0.5}$$

$$Alternate \ Risk \ Ratio = \mathbf{.25/.50} = \mathbf{0.50}$$

Must an LEA meet the definition for significant disproportionality in each of the categories before being identified with significant disproportionality?

No. The LEA only needs to meet the definition for one of the 14 categories and one of the 7 racial or ethnic groups to be identified with significant disproportionality.

When is LEA data examined for significant disproportionality, significant discrepancy, and disproportionate representation?

Identification and Placement data will be examined and districts notified by March each year; Discipline data will be examined by September each year; LEAs will be notified by October.

Where does the data being examined come from?

Identification and placement data is taken from the October 1st Special Education Child Count submitted to ADVISER. Discipline data is taken from data submitted by LEAs throughout the year in ADVISER with a June deadline.

How will an LEA be notified if they have significant disproportionality or are in a cautionary zone for significant disproportionality?

LEAs found to have a risk ratio of at least 3.0, but less than 4.0 in the current year in one or more of the 98 calculation categories are considered to be in cautionary zone 3 for significant disproportionality and will be notified in writing by NDE.

LEAs found to have a risk ratio of 4.0 or more in one or more of the 98 calculation categories in the current year, but not in both prior years are considered to be in cautionary zone 4 for significant disproportionality and will be notified in writing by NDE.

LEAs found to have a risk ratio of 4.0 or more in one or more of the 98 calculation categories in the current year and the two prior years are considered to have significant disproportionality and will be notified in writing by NDE.

LEAs with significant disproportionality are federally required to use IDEA funds for Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS). Cautionary Zones 3 and 4 are designed to help LEAs avoid getting to the point of significant disproportionality. LEAs in these cautionary zones and LEAs identified for indicators B4, B9, and B10 are required or encouraged to take certain actions as described in Table 1. A version of the table, modified for the first year of implementation of the new approach, appears in Table 2.

What happens if a LEA is identified as having significant disproportionality?

LEAs found to have significant disproportionality must identify and address the factors contributing to the significant disproportionality. NDE will provide support for this process. One tool that will be required is IDC's Success Gaps Toolkit.

Additionally, the LEA must set aside 15 percent of their special education funds to provide Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services designed to help address the factors identified.

Where can I find additional information about Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS)?

A guidance document around CEIS and CCEIS is located on the NDE Special Education website at http://www.education.ne.gov/sped/finance.html

Can a LEA provide early intervening services even if they aren't identified with Significant Disproportionality?

Yes, LEAs may voluntarily set aside up to 15 percent of their special education funds to provide Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS). A LEA might choose to do this, for example, if they have been identified in the Cautionary Zone for disproportionality.

How can an LEA be disproportionate when the population is fairly homogenous?

When an LEA has a very small number of students in its second largest racial/ethnic group, it would be unreliable to calculate a risk ratio because the comparison group is too small. In these cases, the comparison group is switched from the district level to the state level. This is called an alternate risk ratio. An alternate risk ratio must be understood differently than a risk ratio. To take an example,

- an LEA with a risk ratio of 4.0 for white students in the autism category should think: "white students in my LEA are four times as likely as non-white students in my LEA to be identified with autism," but

- An LEA with an alternate risk ratio of 4.0 for white students in the autism category should think: "white students in my LEA are four times as likely as non-white students in Nebraska to be identified with autism."

The risk ratio makes a clear statement about racial or ethnic disproportionality. The alternate risk ratio needs further investigation. Alternate risk ratios compare two risks:

- The risk for students of the identified racial/ethnic group in the LEA

- The risk for students NOT of the identified racial/ethnic group in the state

As a preliminary step in their root cause analysis, LEAs identified with alternate risk ratios are encouraged to compare two additional risks:

- The risk for students of the identified racial/ethnic group in the state,

- The risk for all students in the state.

> " When an LEA has a very small number of students in its second largest racial/ethnic group, it would be unreliable to calculate a risk ratio because the comparison group is too small. In these cases, the comparison group is switched from the district level to the state level.

In some cases, alternate risk ratios say little about racial and ethnic disproportionalities and, instead, say much about the overrepresentation of students from the identified LEA as compared to the rest of the state in a disability category, in the placement of students in more restrictive environments, or in the disciplining of students.

Table 1: LEA Required and Recommended Responses to Equity Identifications & SEA Support

Identified for	Required PPP Checklist for Identification	Required PPP Checklist for Placement	Required PPP Checklist for Dis	Required FACILITATED SG Toolkit	Reqrd SG Toolkit	Reqrd Action Plan	Rcmnd Action Plan	Rcmnd SG Toolkit	SEA Support
B4a: > 5% of SWD long-term suspended or expelled			✓					✓	• Provide PPP checklist and guidance for completing • Provide link to Success Gaps Toolkit and Introductory Video
B4b: > 5% of [identified racial/ethnic group] SWDs long-term suspended or expelled			✓					✓	• Provide PPP checklist and guidance for completing • Provide link to Success Gaps Toolkit and Introductory Video
B9: All SWDs (ages 6–21) with RR* ≥ 3 by racial/ethnic group for the current year	✓							✓	• Provide PPP checklist and guidance for completing • Provide link to Success Gaps Toolkit and Introductory Video
B10: [Category] SWDs (ages 6–21) with RR* ≥ 3 by racial/ethnic group for the current year	✓							✓	• Provide PPP checklist and guidance for completing • Provide link to Success Gaps Toolkit and Introductory Video
Significant Disproportionality Cautionary Zone 3: maximum RR* ≥ 3.0, but < 4.0 for most recent year	If identified in this area	If identified in this area	If identified in this area		✓		✓		• Provide PPP checklist(s) and guidance for completing • Webinar for in-depth review of Success Gaps Toolkit • Webinar on Action Planning • Review of completed Success Gaps Rubric

*For each LEA, 98 calculations are required: 98 = 7 racial/ethnic groups times 14 categories. Small cell and n sizes can create exceptions. When the cell size of the target group is less than 10 or the n size of the target group is less than 30, the calculation is skipped. When the cell size of the comparison group is less than 10 or the n size of the comparison group is less than 30, the alternate risk ratio is substituted for the risk ratio.

Table 1: LEA Required and Recommended Responses to Equity Identifications & SEA Support (continued)

Identified for	Required PPP Checklist for Identification	Required PPP Checklist for Placement	Required PPP Checklist for Dis	Required FACILITATED SG Toolkit	Regrd SG Toolkit	Regrd Action Plan	Rcmnd Action Plan	Rcmnd SG Toolkit	SEA Support
Significant Disproportionality Cautionary Zone 4: maximum RR* ≥ 4.0 for most recent year, but not both prior years	If identified in this area	If identified in this area	If identified in this area	✓			✓		• Provide PPP checklist(s) and guidance for completing • Series of webinars to form a community of practice for (1) understanding equity data, (2) completing the Success Gaps Rubric and (3) districts to share challenges and successes • Webinar on Action Planning • Optional review of Action Plan
Significant Disproportionality: maximum RR* ≥ 4.0 for most recent and two prior years, all using the same one of the required 98 annual calculations	If identified in this area	If identified in this area	If identified in this area	✓		✓			• Series of individual LEA team meetings to facilitate (1) developing a comprehensive team, (2) in-depth data analysis, (3) completion of Success Gaps Rubric and identification of root cause(s), including a review of policies, procedures, and practices, (4) evaluation of potential solutions to select best fit, (5) action planning (including planning for effective implementation and evaluation of efforts), and (6) monitoring and improving implementation • Require actions to be reflected in TIP

*For each LEA, 98 calculations are required: 98 = 7 racial/ethnic groups times 14 categories. Small cell and n sizes can create exceptions. When the cell size of the target group is less than 10 or the n size of the target group is less than 30, the calculation is skipped. When the cell size of the comparison group is less than 10 or the n size of the comparison group is less than 30, the alternate risk ratio is substituted for the risk ratio.

Table 2: LEA Required and Recommended Responses to Equity Identifications & SEA Support (during 2020-21 school year)

Identified for	Required PPP Checklist for Identification	Required PPP Checklist for Placement	Required PPP Checklist for Dis	Required FACILITATED SG Toolkit	Reqrd SG Toolkit	Reqrd Action Plan	Rcmnd Action Plan	Rcmnd SG Toolkit	SEA Support
B4a: > 5% of SWD long-term suspended or expelled [19-20 will be calculated in October 2020]		✓							• Provide PPP checklist and guidance for completing; review self-assessment
B4b: > 5% of [identified racial/ethnic group] SWDs long-term suspended or expelled [19-20 will be calculated in October 2020]	✓		✓						• Provide PPP checklist and guidance for completing; review self-assessment
B9: All SWDs (ages 6-21) with RR* ≥ 3 by racial/ethnic group for the current year	✓								• Provide PPP checklist and guidance for completing; review self-assessment
B10: [Category] SWDs (ages 6-21) with RR* ≥ 3 by racial/ethnic group for the current yearr	If identified in this area	If identified in this area	If identified in this area						• Provide PPP checklist and guidance for completing; review self-assessment
Significant Disproportionality Cautionary Zone 3: maximum RR* ≥ 3.0, but < 4.0 for most recent year	If identified in this area	If identified in this area	If identified in this area						• Provide PPP checklist and guidance for completing; review self-assessment

*For each LEA, 98 calculations are required: 98 = 7 racial/ethnic groups times 14 categories. Small cell and n sizes can create exceptions. When the cell size of the target group is less than 10 or the n size of the target group is less than 30, the calculation is skipped. When the cell size of the comparison group is less than 10 or the n size of the comparison group is less than 30, the alternate risk ratio is substituted for the risk ratio.

Identified for	Required PPP Checklist for Identification	Required PPP Checklist for Placement	Required PPP Checklist for Dis	Required FACILITATED SG Toolkit	Reqrd SG Toolkit	Reqrd Action Plan	Rcmnd Action Plan	Rcmnd SG Toolkit	SEA Support
Significant Disproportionality Cautionary Zone 4: maximum RR* ≥ 4.0 for most recent year, but not both prior years	If identified in this area	If identified in this area	If identified in this area						• Provide PPP checklist and guidance for completing; review self-assessment
Significant Disproportionality: maximum RR* ≥ 4.0 for most recent and two prior years, all using the same one of the required 98 annual calculations	If identified in this area	If identified in this area	If identified in this area	✓			✓		• Provide PPP checklist and guidance for completing; review self-assessment

*For each LEA, 98 calculations are required: 98 = 7 racial/ethnic groups times 14 categories. Small cell and n sizes can create exceptions. When the cell size of the target group is less than 10 or the n size of the target group is less than 30, the calculation is skipped. When the cell size of the comparison group is less than 10 or the n size of the comparison group is less than 30, the alternate risk ratio is substituted for the risk ratio.

Timeline for 2020-21 school year

August to December 2020. SG Toolkit for districts with significant disproportionality

September 2020. Calculations completed for discipline 2019-20

October 2020. PPP Checklists completed for 2018-19 identifications, also supporting documents, including student files as requested by NDE.

January to April 2021. Action plan completed for districts with significant disproportionality, including a CCEIS budget.

March 2021. PPP Checklists completed for 2019-20 identifications, also supporting documents, including student files as requested by NDE.

March 2021. Calculations completed for identification and placement, 2020–21. District leadership teams are formed or continued for any districts with significant disproportionality or in cautionary zone 4 for significant disproportionality.